

3, 4, 8, 9 and 12 have been amended. In fact, of the pending claims, claims 8, 10 and 12 were amended in the Preliminary Amendment of November 15, 2000 and claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9 and 12 were amended in the Amendment of May 30, 2002. The Examiner further indicates that 24-26 have been amended. Such is not the case, they were newly added in the May 30, 2002 Amendment.

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite (as the undersigned understands it, claim 13, which depends from claim 12 is included in this rejection in view of the inclusion of claim 13 in the rejection in the Office Action dated January 30, 2002 and further in view of the Examiner's indication on page 1 of the Action (item 6) that claim 13 stands rejected - clarification is, however, requested). Withdrawal of the rejection is in order in view of the above-noted claim cancellations which render the rejection moot. Should the Examiner not have intended that claim 13 be included in the rejection, she is urged to contact the undersigned by phone before taking further action so that the claim can be reinstated.

Claims 11 and 24-26 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. Cancellation of the rejected claims renders the rejection moot.

That claims have been cancelled should not be taken as an indication that Applicant agrees with any view expressed by the Examiner. Rather, claims have been cancelled merely to advance prosecution and Applicant reserves the right to pursue any deleted subject matter in a continuation application. As regards the Examiner's rejection of claim 11, particularly, attention is directed to the fact that no basis for the rejection exists and, indeed, that the Examiner has misinterpreted the claim is clear from the Examiner's comments. Specifically, the Examiner states at the bottom of page 2 of the Action that "Claim 11 is drawn to an agent ...". Such is not the case. Claim 11 is drawn to the method of allowed claim 10, from which it depends. The only difference between claims 10 and 11 is that in the latter the composition is indicated as including a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier. This possibility is clearly encompassed within the scope of claim 10. Nonetheless, claim 11 has been cancelled, without prejudice, merely to advance this case to allowance.

KOUZARIDES -- Serial No.: 09/700,417

This application is submitted to be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE, P.C.

By Mary J. Wilson  
Mary J. Wilson  
Reg. No. 32,955

MJW:tat

1100 North Glebe Road  
8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Arlington, Virginia 22201-4714  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100